

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

Laying the foundations for a formal theory of drama

This is the author's manuscript

Original Citation:

Availability:

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/29011> since

Publisher:

Springer

Published version:

DOI:10.1007/11558590_29

Terms of use:

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)

Abstract. The goal of this research is to lay the foundations for a formal theory of drama, that abstracts from the procedural and interactive aspects involved in the generation of dramatic content. The theory characterizes dramatic qualities by reconciling the structural accounts provided by traditional drama analysis with an agent-based perspective on characters.

1 Motivations and Formalization

In the design of AI systems for communication and entertainment, much attention has been devoted to the dramatic qualities exhibited by interactive applications. These applications span from artificial characters for entertainment and instruction, to intelligent systems for storytelling and drama [1,2,3]. The aim of this paper is to lay the foundations of a formal theory that systematizes the basic aspects of drama in a principled, explicit model, with an immediate integration with agent-based theories. This theory, called *Drammar*, abstracts from the interactive and procedural aspects of drama, and is intended as the starting point for specifying, implementing and designing practical storytelling systems in a principled way.

The notions of direction, character and plot, pervasive throughout the literature on drama analysis since Aristotle, are the three main components of the drama model incorporated in *Drammar*. The goal of a drama is to make audience perceive intuitively called a “story” by displaying the actions of some *characters* in a sequence of actions organized in a *plot*; the plot moves toward a *direction*. Concerning the structure of drama, it has been a well known convention to segment the list of actions to form a drama into a number of units or sections [6]. Such units, despite terminology disparities, are of the same nature, so that some authors define drama as a recursive “fractal” structure [7].

Drammar is structured in two levels: the *actional* level models the intentionality and behaviour of the characters in a plot as intelligent, goal-directed agents. The *directional* level accounts for dramatic meaning, abstracting from the intentionality of the characters through the use of attributes that model the effect of plot incidents onto the characters' rational and emotional state. The *drama direction* is a change function that transforms the rational and emotional state of a character into a different state [4]. Such a function is defined through values assigned to a number of *attributes* of the characters (*personae*), defined as a set of attributes. The set of attributes defining a character combines a rational, BDI perspective with an emotional component.

each attribute only one assignment is permitted.

The Direction is a function D that specifies the value changes of the c attributes after the execution of the plot. So, the domain of the direction function is State (where a State is a set of Polarities of attributes), and the co-domain is State. So, let a State be $\bigcup_i CHAR_i.POLARITY$:

$$\mathcal{D} : State_i \rightarrow State_f$$

The relationship between the value changes of the rational/emotional state of characters and the actual actions and events listed in a drama is stated at the plot level through the notion of *drama goal*. The drama goal is the world state that the Direction, and it is operatively specified as the achievement or the negation of a goal of a certain character, namely the drama protagonist.

The Plot is the component that carries out the polarity inversions described by the Direction function. The Plot is a sequence of elementary units called Beats. Beats are actional units formed by a action-reaction pair [6]. Notice that some Beats do not change any attribute value, but every change does occur in some Beat.

The three components described above form a Drama-unit, that represents all the basic aspects of drama. Formally, a Drama-unit is a triple:

- *Dramatis-personae* is a finite set of Dramatis-persona;
- *Direction* is a function \mathcal{D} defined as above;
- *Plot* is a list of Beats $\langle B_1, B_2, \dots, B_m \rangle$,

and the condition holds that at least one attribute inverts its polarity.

In Drammar, drama-units are subdivided into smaller drama-units, resulting in a tree of drama-units. The leaves of this tree are directly connected to beats, and its root is properly called drama, the highest-level unit that subsumes the entire sequence of drama-units and is not subsumed by other drama-units. The units of the drama and their actions are combined in a drama-specific progression related with the emotional engagement of the audience via the protagonist's fate. Dramatic actions in the plot trace a curve towards the fulfilment of the direction. Each drama-unit, with its goal, has both a position and a *dramatic value* within the plot. This value is given by the number of value changes that occur within the unit, either in a beat directly included by the unit or in a beat included in one of its sub-units.

2 An Example

We apply the formal system Drammar to the definition of a linear drama, known Hitchcock's *North by Northwest* [8] (see the table in Figure 1). *North by Northwest* is about a middle-aged advertising executive Roger Thornhill who is mistaken for the (non-existent) government agent George Kaplan by a gang of spies lead by the villainous bad man. He gets involved in a series of misadventures and is pursued across

2	R. gets aware of mismatch and tries get out of trouble	Involved (Roger) True	Individualism	-	BELIEF.norms
2.1	R. meets Vandamm	Agreement (Roger,Vandamm) False	Disappointment	+	EMOTION.prospect-based
2.1.1	Vandamm addresses R. as Kaplan	Mentioned (Vandamm,Kaplan) True	Distress	+	EMOTION.well-being
2.1.2	Vandamm threatens R. of death	Threatened (Vandamm,Roger) True	Anger	+	EMOTION.well-being/attribution
2.1.3	Vandamm's gang tries to kill R.; R. escapes	Killed (gang, Roger) False	Relief	+	EMOTION.prospect-based
2.2	Nobody believes R.; R. accused of shooting Townsend	Outcast (Roger) True	Isolation	+	BELIEF.world-state
2.2.1	R.'s report not believed by anybody	Discredited (Roger) True	Anger	+	EMOTION.well-being/attribution
2.2.2	R. leaves his mother	Left (Roger.Mother) True	Submission	-	BELIEF.social
2.2.3	R. is believed to have killed Townsend	Falsely_accused (Roger.assassination) True	Disappointment	+	EMOTION.prospect-based
2.3	R. escapes police, meets Eve, seduction, fake appointment	Seduced (Eve,Roger) True	Love	+	EMOTION.attraction
2.3.1	R. runs away by train	Caught (Roger.Train) True	Relief	+	EMOTION.prospect-based
2.3.2	E. hides R. from police in the cabin	Hidden (Roger) True	Gratitude	+	EMOTION.well-being-attribution
2.3.3	R. and E. sleep together	Had_sex (Roger.Eve) True	Satisfaction	+	EMOTION.prospect-based
2.3.4	E. fixes the fake appointment with Kaplan	Deceived (Eve,Roger)/True	Hope	+	EMOTION.prospect-based
2.3.5	Airplane tries to kill R.	Meeting (Roger,Kaplan) False	Disappointment	+	EMOTION.prospect-based
2.4	R. calls E.'s bluff and Professor explains	Explain (Professor,Roger) True	Anger	+	EMOTION.well-being-attribution
2.4.1	R. discloses E.	Deceive (Eve,Roger) False	Reproach	+	EMOTION.attribution
2.4.2	R. finds about Vandamm and E.	Unmasked (Roger.Vandamm) True	Anger	+	EMOTION.well-being-attribution
2.4.3	R. arrested and meets Prof.	Meeting (Professor,Roger) True	Truth	+	BELIEF.world-state
2.4.4	E.'s identity revealed	Revealed (Eve's identity,Roger) True	Pity	+	EMOTION.fortune-of-others
3	R. takes revenge	Married (Roger,Eve) True	Family	+	BELIEF.norms
3.1	E. pretends shooting R. at M. Rushmore	Collaboration (Roger,Eve) True	Relationship	+	BELIEF.social
3.1.1	E. fake-shoots R.	Deceived (Roger,Vandamm) True	Satisfaction	+	EMOTION.prospect-based
3.1.2	E. to leave with Vandamm	Coupled (Roger,Eve) True	Love	+	EMOTION.attraction
3.2	Chase and fight at M. Rushmore	Saved (Roger.Eve) True	Gratification	+	EMOTION.well-being/attribution
3.2.1	R. escapes from hospital	Rebellion (Roger,Professor) True	Independence	+	BELIEF.normative
3.2.2	Leonard discloses Eve's secret	Informs (Leonard,Vandamm, Eve's trick) True	Fear	+	EMOTION.prospect-based
3.2.3	R. kills Leonard on M. Rushmore	Killed (Roger,Leonard) True	Relief	+	EMOTION.prospect-based

Fig. 1. Analysis of North by Northwest

by both the spies and the government whilst being helped by a beautiful blonde, the CIA agent, Eve. Eventually, he will discover that Eve is an undercover CIA agent and that she is helping him. They will defeat the evil gang, on a thrilling sequence on the Mount Rushmore.

The first column, ID, reports the hierarchical structure of Drama-units in North by Northwest (the table rows); the levels of the hierarchy correspond to acts, sequences, and scenes in the standard filmic terminology. The second column, Description

have been affected, so as to make him more inclined to help the others (the “Involved (Roger)” becomes true). This goal is in turn accomplished through the goals of the sub-units of that unit: Roger’s individualism is affected by the need to get himself out of the troubles he got into (Sequences 2.1 and 2.2), by Eve’s seduction and by the awareness of a conflict between the CIA and Vandamm (2.4).

The last three columns, Attribute, Value and Attribute-type, describe the dynamics of each Drama-unit. For example, in Act I, Roger falls into an emotional state of distress as a consequence of being kidnapped by Vandamm’s gang, setting the “distress” attribute to +; in the second act, Roger’s “individualism” is set +. The subtype of each attribute is expressed by the dot notation: for example, “BELIEF.norms” referred to as “belief-norms” means that this attribute belongs to the normative component of the character’s beliefs, which are part of the rational component of the character. For emotional states, the notation refers to the emotional classes described in OCC model [5].

3 Conclusions and Future Work

The definition of drama proposed in this paper is a first step toward a comprehensive formal system for analyzing and generating drama. The current theory leaves open for research the task of identifying the instruments by which the formal model can be incorporated into practical systems.

The theory describes drama as an off-line object, and does not specifically address the interactive generation of drama. The extension of the provisional model to the linear case, where the list of units in the plot is not pre-determined, represents a new line of research in the development of a comprehensive theory.

References

1. Bryan Loyall, A., Bates, J.: Personality-rich believable agents that use language. In: Johnson, W., ed.: Proc. of the First Int. Conference on Autonomous Agents. (1997)
2. Staller, A., Petta, P.: Towards a tractable appraisal-based architecture. In: Camacho, M., Numaoka, C., Petta, P., eds.: Workshop: Grounding Emotions in Adaptive Systems. (1997)
3. Cavazza, M., Charles, F., Mead, S.: Interacting with virtual characters in interactive storytelling. In: Proc. of AAMAS02 (2002)
4. Egri, L.: The Art of Dramatic Writing. Simon and Schuster, New York (1960) (1942)
5. A. Ortony, G.C., Collins, A.: Cognitive Structure of Emotions. Cambridge Univ. Press (1988)
6. McKee, R.: Story. Harper Collins, New York (1997)
7. Lavandier, Y.: La dramaturgie. Le clown et l’enfant, Cergy (1994)
8. E. Lehman: North by Northwest. Directed by A. Hitchcock. Photographed by R. E. Brown, C. Grant, E. M. Saint, J. Mason. Metro Goldwyn Mayer (1959)